Case 14-01032-rcj Doc 138 Entered 11/13/14 15:07:16 Page 1 of 3

Case 14-01032-rcj Doc 138 Entered 11/13/14 15:07:16 Page 2 of 3

As noted by the CRT in its Opposition/Response (Doc 134), defendants believe that the Court's Order (Doc 133) (the "Order") had the effect of removing the CRT from this action. Defendants therefore agree that the *Objection to the CRT Acting as the Real Party in Interest and Motion for Substitution, Joinder, or Ratification of the Real Parties in Interest* (Doc 131) (the "Motion") is moot. Because the CRT has not affirmed its understanding is the same, Defendants did not withdraw the Motion.

Defendants urge the Court to rule, consistent with its Order, that the CRT's claims are no longer at issue, and that the Motion is therefore moot. If the Court rules otherwise and gives the CRT the opportunity to file additional points and authorities in response to the Motion, defendants ask for leave to file reply points and authorities.

Dated this day of November, 2014.

Timothy S. Cory, Esq. Michael D. Rawlins, Esq. Attorneys for McAlan Duncan

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of Durham Jones & Pinegar and that I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the Reply Points and Authorities in Support of Objection to the CRT Acting as the Real Party in Interest and Motion for Substitution, Joinder, or Ratification of the Real Parties in Interest, n the following manner:

[X] a. Electronic Service on dates of filing

Under Administrative Order 02-1 (Rev. 8-31-04) of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada, the above-referenced documents were electronically filed and served through the Notice of Electronic Filing automatically generated by that Court's facilities on the dates of filing.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 13th day of November, 2014.

Gina M. LaCascia Gina M. LaCascia An employee of Durham Jones & Pinegar